



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/674,852	12/14/2000	Axel Schamal	225/49355	5694

23911 7590 02/19/2002

CROWELL & MORING LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP
P.O. BOX 14300
WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300

EXAMINER

REIS, TRAVIS M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2859

DATE MAILED: 02/19/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/674,852

Applicant(s)

SCHAMAL, AXEL

Examiner

Travis M Reis

Art Unit

2859

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 November 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 8.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawyer (U.S. Patent 5678703).

With reference to claims 1, 2, 6, & 7, Sawyer discloses a device (12) comprising a spike/screw (15) for fitting into a hole, and an attachment element (11) having an essentially hemispherical or partially spherical shell, with an insert (20) arranged within the shell which can be connected releasably to the spike and, with the spike fitted into the hole, rests on the component surface (15) surrounding the hole (Figures 1 & 2). Sawyer does not disclose the attachment element being produced of any particular material.

The particular types of materials used to make the insert and shell, absent any criticality, is only considered to be the use of a " preferred " or " optimum " material out of a plurality of well known materials that a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have find obvious to provide using routine experimentation based, among other things, on the intended use of Applicant's apparatus, i.e., suitability for the intended use of Applicant's apparatus. See In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416 (CCPA 1960) where the court stated that a selection of a

Art Unit: 2859

material on the basis of suitability for intended use of an apparatus would be entirely obvious. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to make the insert out of magnetic material and the shell out of non-magnetic material in order that the spike through a hole surrounded by a metallic surface of a component would adhere firmly and not drop away.

With reference to claims 3 & 4, Sawyer discloses the spike has an upper part (19) which is designed with a screw thread, can be passed through the insert and can be screwed to the inside of the shell (Figures 1 & 2).

With reference to claims 5 & 8-10, Official Notice is taken with respect to the fastening of the spike in an asymmetrical manner to the attachment element since it is very well known in the art to use that anything can be connected in an asymmetrical manner to anything. Thus, to include fastening of a spike in an asymmetrical manner to the attachment element as claimed would have been no invention and obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made since the device will be more likely the majority of time to be connected in an asymmetrical manner than in a perfectly symmetrical manner.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hall discloses a locator for use in forming metal articles (U.S. Patent 2419134). Poland discloses a hole-centering adapter in a coordinate measurement machine (U.S. Patent 3389472). Anderson discloses a centering device for a lathe (U.S. Patent 2484801). Friemark discloses gageplugs for measuring the


Art Unit: 2859

center distance between tapped holes (U.S. Patent 3308545). Papps et al. discloses a hole position gauging means USP 3026621). Kusaki discloses a centering device for a hole (JP 01224609 A).

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Travis M Reis whose telephone number is (703) 305-4771. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00--5:00 Monday--Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Diego Gutierrez can be reached on (703) 308-3875. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Travis M Reis
Examiner
Art Unit 2859
tmr
February 8, 2002



Diego Gutierrez
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800

Art Unit: 2859

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Diego Gutierrez can be reached on (703) 308-3875. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Travis M Reis
Examiner
Art Unit 2859

tmr
June 14, 2002



Diego Gutierrez
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800